

# Bryc's random fields: the existence and distributions analysis

Wojciech Matysiak, Paweł J. Szablowski  
 Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science,  
 Warsaw University of Technology,  
 Pl. Politechniki 1,  
 00-661 Warsaw, Poland

## Abstract

We examine problem of existence of stationary random fields with linear regressions and quadratic conditional variances, introduced by Bryc [2]. Distributions of the fields are identified and almost complete description of the possible sets of parameters defining the first two conditional moments is given. This note almost solves Bryc's problem concerning fields undetermined by moments - the only remaining set of parameters for which the existence of Bryc's fields is unclear has Lebesgue measure zero.

## 1 Introduction

This note deals with square integrable random sequences  $\mathbf{X} = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with the first two conditional moments given for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  by

$$\mathbb{E}(X_k | \dots, X_{k-2}, X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}, X_{k+2}, \dots) = L(X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbb{E}(X_k^2 | \dots, X_{k-2}, X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}, X_{k+2}, \dots) = Q(X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}), \quad (2)$$

where  $L$  is a symmetric linear polynomial and  $Q$  is a symmetric quadratic polynomial. Such processes have been considered by Bryc [2], who, among other things, identified one-dimensional distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  for a special class of quadratic functions  $Q$ . In [3] Markov chains with the same conditional structure has been investigated. In [6] a thorough analysis of the condition defining first conditional moments in Bryc's paper [2] has been carried, which has made it possible to omit some of the assumptions from [2] and simplify the proof of the result contained therein.

The aim of this paper is to analyze random sequences satisfying (1) and (2) without any restrictions on the parameters defining polynomials  $L$  and  $Q$ ; the main result is Theorem 1, in which description of almost all possible combinations of the parameters is given and the distributions of the sequences are

identified. One of the conclusions of this analysis is partial negative answer to a question posed by Bryc in [2], whether there exist processes satisfying (1) and (2), whose one-dimensional distributions are not identified by moments. The answer is based on some calculations involving Al-Salam-Chihara polynomials, as it was shown in [4]. In addition, we reduce a number of assumptions from [2].

The paper is organized as follows. Subsection 1.1 lists the assumptions used throughout the paper. Section 2 contains the statements of the main results (their proofs are presented in section 4) and some remarks. The next section contains auxiliary results and their proofs.

## 1.1 Assumptions and notation

We will follow Bryc in using the term *random field* for  $\mathbf{X}$ , for additional comments see [6].

Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a square integrable random field indexed by the integers, with non-degenerate covariance matrices and constant first two moments, that is  $\mathbb{E}X_k = \mathbb{E}X_0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}X_k^2 = \mathbb{E}X_0^2 \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . After Bryc [2], we assume that conditional structure of  $\mathbf{X}$  is given by (1) and (2) with

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, y) &= a(x + y) + b, \\ Q(x, y) &= A(x^2 + y^2) + Bxy + D(x + y) + C, \end{aligned}$$

$a, b, A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{R}$ . Non-singularity of covariance matrices implies that all random variables  $X_k$  are non-degenerate and there is no loss of generality in assuming that  $\mathbb{E}X_k = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}X_k^2 = 1$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which implies  $b = 0$ .

It has been shown in [6] that (1) implies  $L_2$ -stationarity of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Since the case  $\rho := \text{corr}(X_0, X_1) = 0$  contains sequences of independent random variables (which satisfy (1) and (2) but can have arbitrary distributions), we shall exclude it from the considerations. Observe that non-singularity of the covariance matrices implies  $|\rho| < 1$ . By Theorem 3.1 from [2] (see also Theorems 1 and 2 in [6]),  $\text{corr}(X_0, X_k) = \rho^{|k|}$  and one-sided regressions are linear

$$\mathbb{E}(X_k | \dots, X_{-1}, X_0) = \rho^k X_0. \quad (3)$$

Multiplying (1) by  $X_{k-1}$  and taking the expected value, we see that  $a = \rho / (1 + \rho^2)$ .

Let us define  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}_{\leq m} := \sigma(X_k : k \leq m)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\geq m} := \sigma(X_k : k \geq m)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\neq m} := \sigma(X_k : k \neq m)$ . Throughout this paper  $\text{supp } X$  stands for support of a random variable  $X$ ,  $\#A$  denotes cardinality of a set  $A$ ,  $\mathbb{I}_A$  is its characteristic function, and  $\delta_p$  is the Dirac measure concentrated on  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ .

## 2 Main results and an open problem

In [2] it was assumed  $D = 0$  and

$$A\left(\rho^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2}\right) + B = 1. \quad (4)$$

The following Theorem describes all valid combinations of parameters from (2) (note that taking the expected value of (2) one gets that  $C = 1 - 2A - B\rho^2$ ) and identifies the distributions of relevant fields.

**Theorem 1** *There do not exist standardized random fields  $\mathbf{X} = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with non-singular covariance matrices, satisfying (1) and (2) and  $\rho \neq 0$ , unless  $D = 0$  and either  $B = 0$  or (4) holds with  $B \in \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \mathcal{B}_3$ , where*

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \left\{ \frac{\rho^2 - 1}{\rho^2(1 + \rho^2)} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_2 = \left( 0, \frac{2\rho^2}{(1 + \rho^2)^2} \right],$$

$$\mathcal{B}_3 = \left\{ \frac{2\rho^2}{(1 + \rho^2)^2} \cdot \frac{(1 - \rho^4)(1 + \rho^{2/m})}{2(\rho^{2/m} - \rho^4)} : m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if  $D = B = 0$  or  $D = 0$  and (4) holds with  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$  then the relevant fields exist and have the following distributions:

1. If  $B = 0$  and  $A = 1/2$  then  $X_k^2 = X_{k+1}^2$  for all  $k$ ; if additionally there exists  $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\Pr(X_{k_0} = 0) = 0$  then  $X_k = RY_k$ ,  $R$  and  $Y_k$  are independent,  $R \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}R^2 = 1$  and all random variables  $Y_k$  are symmetric with values  $\pm 1$ ;
2. If  $B = 0$  and  $A \neq 1/2$  then all random variables  $X_k$  are symmetric with values  $\pm 1$ ;
3. If (4) holds then for all  $B \in \left( 0, 2\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2 \right)$  all one-dimensional distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  are equal to a uniquely determined symmetric and absolutely continuous distribution (depending on  $B$ ) supported on a finite interval;
4. If (4) holds and  $B = 2\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2$  then  $X_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Theorem 2** *If (4) holds with  $D = 0$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$  then there do not exist the relevant random fields  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfying (1-2) with  $\rho \neq 0$  and such that sequence  $(X_k^2)_k$  is uniformly integrable and  $\Pr(X_{k-1} = 0) < 1$ .*

**Open Problem 1** *Do there exist random fields  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfying (1-2) with  $\rho \neq 0$ ,  $D = 0$ , and such that (4) holds with  $B \in \mathcal{B}_3$ ?*

Theorem 3 strengthens Theorem 2.3 from [3] by stating that  $\mathbf{X}$  is always a Markov chain and relaxing assumptions for the uniquely determined case.

**Theorem 3** *If  $\mathbf{X}$  is a standardized random field with non-singular covariance matrices, satisfying (1) and (2),  $\rho \neq 0$ , and such that  $D = B = 0$  or  $D = 0$  and (4) holds with  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$ , then  $\mathbf{X}$  is a stationary Markov chain.  $\mathbf{X}$  has uniquely determined finite-dimensional distributions unless  $B = D = 0$  and  $A = 1/2$ .*

Clearly, if  $A = 1/2$ ,  $B = D = 0$  then distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  can be arbitrary (but symmetric). Observe that in this case condition (2) is trivial.

## 2.1 Remarks

1. Unlike Bryc [2], we do not assume  $L_2$ -stationarity of  $\mathbf{X}$  (which is proved in [6]), nor do we assume equality of its one-dimensional distributions (it is stated in Theorem 1). However, to give a simple and uniform description of the considered random fields, we shall apply some results of Bryc from [2]. One can easily verify that the results from [2], used in sections 3 and 4, do only use assumptions listed in subsection 1.1 (in particular, they do not rely on the equality of one-dimensional distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$ ).
2. We do not use assumption (6) from [2]. The only restriction on the correlation coefficients (apart from those stemming from non-singularity of covariance matrices - see [6], Remark 2) will be requirement that  $\rho \neq 0$ .
3. Bryc [2] assumed  $D = 0$  and (4) and introduced new parameters

$$R := B \left( \rho + \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^2, \quad q := \frac{\rho^4 + R - 1}{1 + \rho^4(R - 1)}. \quad (5)$$

Using some facts concerning  $q$ -Hermite polynomials he proved (under additional assumption of equality of one-dimensional distributions, see [2], Theorem 3.2) implications (3) and (4) of the above Theorem and the fact that then there do not exist  $\mathbf{X}$  with  $R < 0$  (equivalently  $B < 0$ ). (If  $R = B = 0$  then Bryc showed that one-dimensional distributions are symmetric with values  $\pm 1$ , what can be deduced from Theorem 1, since then (4) implies  $A = \rho^2 / (1 + \rho^4) \neq 1/2$ .) Bryc also raised a question (Concluding remarks, 4) whether there exist stationary processes which satisfy conditions (1), (2), (4) and  $D = 0$ , corresponding to  $R > 2$  (equivalently  $B > 2\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2$ ). As Theorem 1 shows, the answer is almost negative. More precisely there exists a discrete set of possible values of  $B$  all contained in the interval  $(2\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2, 1]$  for which one-dimensional distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  have all moments but are not determined by moments and all conditional distributions  $X_j | X_k, j \neq k$  are discrete.

4. The densities from implication (3) in Theorem 1 have explicit product representation - see [2], Concluding remarks 3.
5. Observe that the case considered in Theorem 2 leads to undefined value of  $q$  (see (5)). Therefore it has to be examined separately. In this case (unlike in cases in which  $q$  as a function of  $B$  is determined), we cannot apply Corrolary 5.1 from [2] and deduce existence of higher moments of  $\mathbf{X}$ . If we knew that all moments exist, then of course we could have dropped the uniform integrability assumption.

## 3 Auxiliary results

**Proposition 4** *Let  $A \neq 1 / (1 + \rho^2)$ . If  $\# \text{supp } X_k = 2$  for all  $k$  then  $D = B = 0$  and  $X_k \sim (\delta_{-1} + \delta_1) / 2$ , or (4) holds and  $D = 0$ .*

**Proof.** From the proof of Lemma 5.2, [2] (note that there is a minor misprint in [2] in the formula for  $\mathbb{E}(X_1^2|X_0)$ , repeated in the proof of Proposition 3.1) it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \alpha_1 X_k^2 + \beta_1 X_k + \gamma_1, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{k+2}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \alpha_2 X_k^2 + \beta_2 X_k + \gamma_2 \quad (7)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \frac{A(1-\rho^2) + B\rho^2}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}, \alpha_2 = \frac{(1+\rho^2)(A+B\rho^2) - \rho^2}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}, \\ \beta_1 &= \frac{D(1+\rho^2)}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}, \beta_2 = \frac{D(1+\rho^2)^2}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}, \\ \gamma_1 &= \frac{C}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}, \gamma_2 = \frac{C(1+\rho^2)}{1-A(1+\rho^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\mathbb{E}(X_{k+2}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(X_{k+2}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k+1})|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}]$ , therefore for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\alpha_2 X_k^2 + \beta_2 X_k + \gamma_2 = \alpha_1^2 X_k^2 + X_k \beta_1 (\alpha_1 + \rho) + \gamma_1 (\alpha_1 + 1). \quad (8)$$

First assume that

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1^2 = \alpha_2 \\ \beta_1 (\alpha_1 + \rho) = \beta_2 \\ \gamma_1 (\alpha_1 + 1) = \gamma_2 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

This after some easy algebra gives

$$D \{C - (1-\rho) \rho [1 - A(1+\rho^2)]\} = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$C \left[ A \left( \rho^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right) + B - 1 \right] = 0. \quad (11)$$

If  $C = 0$  then  $D = 0$  by (10) and  $A = (1 - B\rho^2)/2$ . From (6),  $\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = X_k^2$ . Consequently, by symmetry,  $\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{F}_{\geq k+1}) = X_{k+1}^2$ , hence  $\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|X_k^2) = X_k^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|X_{k+1}^2) = X_{k+1}^2$ . By a result of Doob (see [5], page 314)  $X_k^2 = X_{k+1}^2$ , so (since  $\#\text{supp } X_k = 2$ )  $X_k^2 = 1$  and  $X_k \sim (\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)/2$  for all  $k$ . From (2)  $B(X_{k-1}X_{k+1} - \rho^2) = 0$ , so  $B = 0$  by the assumptions on covariance matrices and  $A = 1/2$ .

If  $C \neq 0$  then (11) implies (4) and (10) takes the form

$$D(1-\rho)(1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} - A \right) = 0,$$

hence  $D = 0$ .

Now assume that (9) does not hold. Then the values of  $X_k$  have to be the roots of (8), so all  $X_k$  have to be equidistributed. Observe that  $\mathbb{E}X_k^3 = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Indeed, applying (3) twice one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_{k-1}X_kX_{k+1}) &= \mathbb{E}[X_{k-1}X_k\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k})] = \rho\mathbb{E}(X_{k-1}X_k^2) \\ &= \rho\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(X_{k-1}|\mathcal{F}_{\geq k})X_k^2] = \rho^2\mathbb{E}X_k^3 \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand, by using (1) and (3)

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{k-1}X_kX_{k+1}) = \mathbb{E}[X_{k-1}\mathbb{E}(X_k|\mathcal{F}_{\neq k})X_{k+1}] = \frac{\rho^3}{1+\rho^2}(\mathbb{E}X_{k-1}^3 + \mathbb{E}X_{k+1}^3).$$

Thus  $X_k \sim (\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)/2$  and from (2)

$$B(X_{k-1}X_{k+1} - \rho^2) + D(X_{k-1} + X_{k+1}) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Define  $F_1 := \{X_{k-1} = -X_{k+1}\}$ ,  $F_2 := \{X_{k-1} = X_{k+1}\}$ . By the assumptions on covariance matrices  $\Pr(F_1) \neq 1$  and  $\Pr(F_2) \neq 1$ . Applying (12) to  $\omega \in F_1$  and  $\omega \in F_2$ , we get  $B = 0$  and  $D = 0$ . Note that (2) reduces to a trivial identity.  $\square$

**Proposition 5** *Let  $A \neq 1/(1+\rho^2)$ . If there exists  $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\#\text{supp } X_{k_0} > 2$  then either  $A = 1/2, B = C = D = 0$  and  $X_k^2 = X_{k+1}^2$  for all  $k$ , or (4) holds and  $D = 0 \neq C$ . If, additionally, there exists  $k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\Pr(X_{k_1} = 0) = 0$  then in the first case we have  $X_k = RY_k$ , where  $R \geq 0$ ,  $Y_k \sim (\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)/2$  for all  $k$  and  $R$  and  $Y_k$  are independent.*

**Proof.** We keep the notation from the proof of Proposition 4. If there exists  $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\#\text{supp } X_{k_0} > 2$  then (9) must be satisfied, so (10) and (11) hold.

If  $C = 0$  then  $X_k^2 = X_{k+1}^2$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  as in the proof of Proposition 4. By (2),

$$X_{k-1}[(2A-1)X_{k-1} + BX_{k+1}] = 0. \quad (13)$$

Observe that  $\{X_{k-1} = 0\} = \{X_{k+1} = 0\}$ , so if  $A \neq 1/2$  (hence  $B \neq 0$ ) then  $X_{k+1} = X_{k-1}(1-2A)/B$ , which contradicts the non-singularity of the covariance matrices. Note that if  $A = 1/2$  then (2) is automatically fulfilled. Since  $X_k^2 = X_{k+1}^2 =: R^2$ , where  $R \geq 0$ , then, under the assumption of lack of atom at 0,  $X_k = RY_k$ , where  $\text{supp } Y_k = \{-1, 1\}$ . By (3),  $\mathbb{E}(X_k|X_{k-1}) = R\mathbb{E}(Y_k|X_{k-1}) = \rho R Y_{k-1}$ , so  $\mathbb{E}(Y_k|X_{k-1}) = \rho Y_{k-1}$  and  $\mathbb{E}(Y_k|R) = \rho\mathbb{E}(Y_{k-1}|R)$ . Analogously,  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{k-1}|X_k) = \rho Y_k$  and  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{k-1}|R) = \rho\mathbb{E}(Y_k|R)$ , therefore  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{k-1}|R) = \mathbb{E}(Y_k|R) = 0$ . Hence  $\mathbb{E}(Y_k) = 0$  and  $\Pr(Y_k = 1|R) = \Pr(Y_k = -1|R) = 1/2$ . Thus  $Y_k$  and  $R$  are independent and  $Y_k \sim (\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)/2$ .

If  $C \neq 0$  then (11) implies (4) and  $D = 0$  as in the proof of Proposition 4.

$\square$

The following Lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.

**Lemma 6** *Suppose that (4) holds with  $D = 0$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$ . If  $\mathcal{G}_n := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_{\leq k-1}, \mathcal{F}_{\geq k+n})$  then for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{G}_n) = \frac{1-\rho^{2n}}{1-\rho^{2n+2}}X_{k-1}^2 + \frac{1-\rho^2}{1-\rho^{2n+2}}X_{k+n}^2 + \frac{(\rho^2-1)(1-\rho^{2n})}{\rho^{n+1}(1-\rho^{2n+2})}X_{k-1}X_{k+n}. \quad (14)$$

**Proof.** The proof is by induction on  $n$ . (14) for  $n = 1$  is (2).

Assume that the assertion holds for some  $n \geq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{F}_{\neq k})|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}] = \\ &= AX_{k-1}^2 + A\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) + BX_{k-1}\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}).\end{aligned}$$

By the induction assumption

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\sigma(\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}, \mathcal{F}_{\geq k+n+1}))|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}] = \\ &= \frac{1-\rho^{2n}}{1-\rho^{2n+2}}\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) + \frac{1-\rho^2}{1-\rho^{2n+2}}X_{k+n+1}^2 + \\ &\quad + \frac{(\rho^2-1)(1-\rho^{2n})}{\rho^{n+1}(1-\rho^{2n+2})}X_{k+n+1}\mathbb{E}(X_k|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}).\end{aligned}$$

This, formulae

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_k|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) &= \frac{\rho^{n+1}-\rho^{-n-1}}{\rho^{n+2}-\rho^{-2-n}}X_{k-1} + \frac{\rho-\frac{1}{\rho}}{\rho^{n+2}-\rho^{-2-n}}X_{k+n+1}, \\ \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) &= \frac{\rho^n-\rho^{-n}}{\rho^{n+2}-\rho^{-2-n}}X_{k-1} + \frac{\rho^2-\frac{1}{\rho^2}}{\rho^{n+2}-\rho^{-2-n}}X_{k+n+1}\end{aligned}$$

(see [6], formula (3.4) in the proof of Theorem 2) and an easy observation that  $1-A(1-\rho^{2n})/(1-\rho^{2n+2}) \neq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Proofs of main results

**Proof of Theorem 1.** A starting point of our considerations is Lemma 5.2, formula (16), [2]:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k})[1-A(1+\rho^2)] = X_k^2[A(1-\rho^2)+B\rho^2] + X_kD(1+\rho^2) + C \quad (15)$$

(in fact, the above formula in [2] is given for  $k=0$  only but from its proof it is evident that (15) is true for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ).

If  $A=1/(1+\rho^2)$  then (15) is a quadratic equation and if  $A(1-\rho^2)+B\rho^2 \neq 0$ , equivalently  $B \neq (\rho^2-1)/[\rho^2(\rho^2+1)]$ , it has two solutions, therefore all  $X_k$  must have the same two point distribution. Repeating the reasoning from the proof of Proposition 4, we see that  $\mathbb{E}X_k^3=0$  for all  $k$ , so  $X_k \sim (\delta_{-1}+\delta_1)/2$  and  $B=D=0$ .

If  $A=1/(1+\rho^2)$  and  $B=(\rho^2-1)/[\rho^2(\rho^2+1)]$  then  $C=1-2A-B\rho^2=0$  and  $D=0$  by (15). This case is analyzed in Theorem 2.

Now assume  $A \neq 1/(1+\rho^2)$ . By Propositions 4 and 5, it suffices to examine the case when (4) and  $D=0$  hold. (This is the combination of parameters assumed by Bryc in [2].) In this case,  $\mathbb{E}|X_k|^p < \infty$  for all  $p > 1$  by [2], Corollary 5.1. By the proof of [2], Lemma 6.3, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k-1}] = \rho^n Q_n(X_{k-1}), \quad (16)$$

where  $Q_n$  are  $q$ -Hermite polynomials defined in [2], Subsection 6.1, with  $q$  as in (5). (16) and symmetry imply

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)|X_{k-1}] = \rho^n Q_n(X_{k-1}), \quad \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_{k-1})|X_k] = \rho^n Q_n(X_k),$$

hence for  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)Q_m(X_{k-1})] &= \rho^m \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)Q_m(X_k)] = \rho^n \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_{k-1})Q_m(X_{k-1})], \\ \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_{k-1})Q_m(X_k)] &= \rho^m \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_{k-1})Q_m(X_{k-1})] = \rho^n \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)Q_m(X_k)]. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting  $x := \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_k)Q_m(X_k)]$ ,  $y := \mathbb{E}[Q_n(X_{k-1})Q_m(X_{k-1})]$  one obtains  $\rho^m x = \rho^n y$  and  $\rho^m y = \rho^n x$ , hence (if  $n \neq m$ ),  $x = y = 0$  and  $Q_n$  are orthogonal with respect to  $\mathcal{L}(X_{k-1})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(X_k)$ . By Lemma 6.1, [2] we deduce that there do not exist random fields with (4),  $D = 0$  and  $B < 0$  (equivalently  $q < -1$ ) and (using also Proposition 8.1 from [2]) that assertions 3. and 4. of Theorem 1 are true (by Lemma 6.1, [2], in cases covered by assertions 3. and 4., measures that make  $Q_n$  orthogonal are unique, so one-dimensional distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  are equal).

What is left is to exclude the case of (4),  $D = 0$  and  $B > 2\rho^2/(1+\rho^2)^2$  (equivalently  $q > 1$ ). (This case was unresolved in [2].) To obtain a contradiction, suppose that there exists  $\mathbf{X}$  with this set of parameters and consider the conditional distribution  $\mathcal{L}(X_1|X_0 = y)$ . By [4], Theorem 2, its monic orthogonal polynomials are Al-Salam–Chihara polynomials (see [4] for more details) and satisfy the three term recurrence relation

$$p_{n+1}(x) = (x - \rho y q^n) p_n(x) - (1 - \rho^2 q^{n-1}) [n]_q p_{n-1}(x),$$

where  $[n]_q = 1 + q + \dots + q^{n-1}$ . Since the distribution  $\mathcal{L}(X_1|X_0 = y)$  is a positive measure, the coefficients at the third term in the above recurrence must be non-negative, thus  $(1 - \rho^2 q^{n-1}) \geq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so if  $q \neq \rho^{-2/m}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain a contradiction.

If  $q = \rho^{-2/m}$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  then conditional  $\mathcal{L}(X_1|X_0 = y)$  and two-dimensional  $\mathcal{L}(X_0, X_1)$  distributions do exist. The question whether there exist relevant random fields remains open.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Fix  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since by Lévy's Downward Theorem sequence  $\{\mathbb{E}(X_k^2|\mathcal{G}_n)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$  converges almost surely and in  $L_1$ , multiplying both sides of (14) by the indicator of the event  $\{X_{k-1} \neq 0\}$  and  $\rho^{n+1}$  and letting  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  we see that  $X_n \rightarrow 0$  for almost all  $\omega$ . Now define  $Y_n := \mathbb{E}(X_{n+k}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X_{n+k}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\neq n+k})|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} (\mathbb{E}(X_{k+n-1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) + \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k})) - \frac{1-\rho^2}{\rho^2(1+\rho^2)} \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n-1}X_{k+n+1}|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} - \frac{1-\rho^2}{(1+\rho^2)} \right) \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n-1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) + \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) \\ &= \frac{\rho^2}{1+\rho^2} \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n-1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) + \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} \mathbb{E}(X_{k+n+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \frac{\rho^2}{1+\rho^2} Y_{n-1} + \frac{1}{1+\rho^2} Y_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$



Therefore we have a recurrence with obvious initial conditions  $Y_0 = X_k^2$  and  $Y_1 = \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k})$ . Since its characteristic equation is

$$x^2 - (1 + \rho^2)x + \rho^2 = 0,$$

we have

$$Y_n = C_1 + C_2 \rho^{2n}$$

for some  $\mathcal{F}_{\leq k}$ -measurable random variables  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . Taking the initial conditions into account we obtain

$$C_2 = \frac{X_k^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k})}{1 - \rho^2}, C_1 = -\frac{\rho^2 X_k^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k})}{1 - \rho^2},$$

so

$$Y_n = X_k^2 + \frac{X_k^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k})}{1 - \rho^2} (\rho^{2n} - 1).$$

From the uniform integrability assumption and the fact that  $X_n$  converges almost surely to 0,

$$X_k^2 - \frac{X_k^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k})}{1 - \rho^2} = 0,$$

thus  $\mathbb{E}(X_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \rho^2 X_k^2$ . Since it implies  $\text{var}(X_{k+1} | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = 0$ , we have a contradiction,  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.** By Theorem 1, we have to examine three cases:

1. (4) holds with  $D = 0$  and  $C \neq 0$ ,
2.  $A \neq 1/2$ ,  $B = D = 0$ ,  $C = 1 - 2A \neq 0$ ,
3.  $A = 1/2$ ,  $B = C = D = 0$ .

In the first case  $B \in \left(0, 2\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2\right]$ , what is equivalent to  $\rho^2 / (1 + \rho^2)^2 \leq A < \rho^2 / (1 + \rho^4)$ , so in this case Markov property was proved in Theorem 2.3, [3]. We shall present a different approach, based on (16). Of course, it suffices to prove that for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\Pr(X_{k+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \Pr(X_{k+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_{=k})$ . Fix  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and define  $\alpha_j := \mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) Q_j(X_{k+1})$ , where polynomials  $Q_j$  are  $q$ -Hermite polynomials with  $q$  defined by (5). M. Riesz proved that if a positive measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is determined by moments then  $\mathbb{C}[x]$  is dense in  $L_2(\mu)$  (see [1], Corollary 2.3.3). This implies

$$\mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) \stackrel{L_2}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j Q_j(X_{k+1}). \quad (17)$$

Using (16) one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) - \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j Q_j(X_{k+1}) \right|^2 &\geq \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) - \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j Q_j(X_{k+1}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\leq k} \right] \right|^2 = \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) - \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j \rho^j Q_j(X_k) \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and using (17) we obtain that  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j \rho^j Q_j(X_k)$  in  $L_2$ . If  $\sum \alpha_j^2 < +\infty$  then  $\sum \alpha_j^2 \rho^{2j} \log^2 j < +\infty$ , hence

$$\Pr(X_{k+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{I}_B(X_{k+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j \rho^j Q_j(X_k)$$

almost surely by the Rademacher-Menshov theorem. Thus  $\Pr(X_{k+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_{\leq k}) = \Pr(X_{k+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_{=k})$  almost surely.

Now consider  $A \neq 1/2$ ,  $B = D = 0$ ,  $C = 1 - 2A$ . In this case all random variables are symmetric with values  $\pm 1$ , so this case is the same as (4),  $D = 0$ ,  $A = \rho^2 / (1 + \rho^4)$ , and Markov property follows from Theorem 2.3, [3].

Now consider  $A = 1/2$ ,  $B = C = D = 0$ . Then  $X_k = RY_k$ , with  $R \geq 0$  and all random variables  $Y_k$  symmetric with values  $\pm 1$ . Since  $\Pr(R \geq 0) = 1$  and by (3),  $\mathbb{E}(X_k | X_{k-1}) = R\mathbb{E}(Y_k | X_{k-1}) = \rho RY_{k-1}$ , so  $\mathbb{E}(Y_k | Y_{k-1}) = \rho Y_{k-1}$ , hence  $(Y_k)_k$  is a Markov chain, again by Bryc's argument. Since  $R$  and  $Y_k$  are independent and  $(R, Y) \mapsto RY$  is one-to-one,  $\mathbf{X}$  is a Markov chain.

In the first two cases all finite-dimensional distributions are uniquely determined by Theorem 2.3, [3]. Clearly, one cannot determine distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  when the third case holds.  $\square$

**Acknowledgement** *The authors thank W. Bryc, R. Łatała and J. Wesółowski for several very helpful discussions.*

## References

- [1] Akhiezer, N.I. (1965) The Classical Moment Problem. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh. Translated from the Russian.
- [2] Bryc, W. (2001) Stationary random fields with linear regressions. *Annals of Probability* 29, No. 1, 504-519.
- [3] Bryc, W. (2001) Stationary Markov chains with linear regressions. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 93, 339-348.

- [4] Bryc, W., Matysiak, W., Szablowski, P.J. (2003) Probabilistic aspects of Al-Salam–Chihara polynomials. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society (to appear).  
WWW: <http://arXiv.org/abs/math/0304155>.
- [5] Doob, J. (1953) Stochastic Processes. Wiley, New York.
- [6] Matysiak, W., Szablowski, P.J. (2002) A few remarks on Bryc’s paper on random fields with linear regressions. Annals of Probability 30, No. 3, 1486-1491.